

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were submitted for examination. In this Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 11-14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Dreste et al (US Patent No.: 5,388,252, hereinafter "Dreste"), Claims 4, 8, 10, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Dreste, and Claims 5-6 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreste et al in view of Olah et al ( US Pat. No.: 6,446,119, hereinafter "Olah").

In the foregoing amendments, claims 1 - 2, 4, 7 - 9 and 11 have been amended to further distinguish from the cited reference(s). No new matters are introduced. Claims 1-20 are pending. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested based on the amendments and in view of the following remarks.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. A cited prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention under 35 USC 102 only if every element of the claimed invention is identically shown in the single reference, arranged as they are in the claim. MPEP 2131; in re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Each and every limitation of the claimed invention is significant and must be found in the single cited prior reference. In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 266 USPQ 619, 621 (Feb. Cir. 1985). As set forth more fully below, neither Dreste nor Olah discloses or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention.

In particular, the amended Claim 1 now recites:

- providing a series of displays on the terminal display, at least some of the displays requiring interactions from a user and being referred to as interactive displays;
- capturing an entire image of one of the interactive displays only after the one of the interactive displays has been altered with at least one interaction from the user in accordance with a predetermined requirement, wherein the entire image is in pixel format and includes source information to record where, when and by who the one of the interactive displays has been interacted, future modifications to the source information associated with the captured image is tracked;
- continuing to successively display a next one of the interactive displays till a last one of the interactive displays, wherein each of captured images some of the interactive displays includes at least one interaction from the user in accordance with a predetermined requirement; and

sending at least some of the captured images to another computing device where the another computing device is configured to generate an evidence that the captured image has not been modified.

(emphasis added)

Paragraphs [0011], [0030] and FIG. 2 specifically support the amended limitations. In particular, the amended claim 1 has the limitations of source information that records where, when and by who the one of the interactive displays has been interacted, future modifications to the source information associated with the captured image is tracked. One of the distinctive features in the amended claim 1 is the ability to track down what and when an interaction to a display has happened, further it records who had the interaction. To further prevent modification to such interaction, another computing device is configured to generate an evidence that the captured image has not been modified (e.g., via a validation module of FIG. 2).

In contrast, Drete teaches remote diagnosis and monitoring systems. To control a remote system, there is no need to capture an entire image of a display screen, which is evidenced in lines 8-10 of Col. 8 “*After the initial full screen image is transmitted, then for each screen refresh only the differences are sent*”. The Examiner stated in the Office Action that a difference of two consecutive image pair can always be reconstructed to a full display via an XOR operator. The Applicant respectfully disagrees because there is no an indication that two consecutive images would be transferred. Because Claim 1 recites the capturing of a display interacted by a user, an entire image of the interacted display is captured. A next display may not have any interaction and will not be captured. By the time a subsequent display is captured, it could be the case that multiple displays have already passed. It is well known in the art that the differences between two non-consecutive images could hardly produce either one of the images. In addition, Drete is silent on captured information that includes source information recording when, what and by who a display has been interacted. Accordingly, it is concluded that Drete fails to teach nor suggest the combined features recited in the once-amended Claim 1.

Olah teaches about monitoring computer usage by capturing displays of a target computer at discrete moments regardless that computer has any activities or not. Olah specifically states between lines 26 - 31 of Col. 6, “*The ‘Manual Setup’ option, 20, specifies that the operator will determine at what discrete moments the monitoring*

*routine will execute screen captures and save these screen captures in an activity log. After selecting options 10 and 20, the operator must specify when the screen captures are to occur.”* In other words, even if there is no any activity on a display, Olah still captures the display, which contradicts what is recited in Claim 1 of this instant application.

Accordingly, it is believed that the once-amended Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references Drete and Olah, viewed alone or in combination. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider Claims 1-10.

Claims 11 is also amended to include the limitations that are supported in Paragraphs [0010], [0011], [0030] and FIG. 2, and would like to point out that one of the distinguished features in Claim 11 over Drete and Olah is “the one of the interactive displays is exclusively associated with an identity of the user ”. Both Drete and Olah do not care who has interacted with a display, when and at where. Drete remotely monitors another computer and records all displays to include interactions entered by anyone while Olah always records the screen regardless of any interactions or not.

Further Claim 11 recites that there is an embedded module automatically triggered to capture a portion of the data in the memory space corresponding to one of the interactive displays after the one of the interactive displays has been altered with at least one interaction from the user”. Drete and Olah are silent on how to access the memory space.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is now believed that the pending claims 1-20 shall be in condition for allowance over the cited references. Therefore, it is believed that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, early and favorable action is being respectfully solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplementary Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (408)777-8873.

Dated this 13th of March, 2007

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, Washington, D.C. 20231,

**E-filed**

on 3/13/2007, 2006.

/joe zheng/  
Joe Zheng

/joe zheng /  
Joe Zheng